IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

> § §

§ §

§

Ş

§

§

§

Ş

§ §

§

ORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS RII, ED COURT NUA CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT Deputy

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

ADOLPHUS TAYLOR,

Petitioner,

VS.

DIVISION,

NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, DIRECTOR, TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Respondent.

NO. 4:06-CV-760-A

ORDER

Came on for consideration the above-captioned action wherein Adolphus Taylor is petitioner and Nathaniel Quarterman, Director, T.D.C.J., Correctional Institutions Division, is respondent. This is a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On September 7, 2007, the United States Magistrate Judge issued his proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation, and ordered that Taylor file objections, if any thereto, by September 28, 2007. By order signed October 7, 2007, the court extended the time during which Taylor could file objections to October 26, 2007. Taylor filed a responsive document within this time period.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court makes a <u>de novo</u> determination of those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which specific objection is United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 673-75 (1980). made.

The court need not address any nonspecific, frivolous, or conclusory objections. <u>Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n</u>, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

The Magistrate Judge recommends that Taylor's petition be denied because some of Taylor's grounds for relief are not cognizable in a federal habeas petition, and the remainder thereof have already been addressed by the state court in Taylor's previous state habeas proceeding. The Magistrate Judge concludes that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d), the state court's determination must stand because Taylor has not shown that the such adjudication resulted in a decision that was contrary to or involved unreasonable application of clearly established federal law or that such decision was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts. In his response to the Magistrate Judge's findings, Taylor does not specifically object to any of the Magistrate Judge's findings or conclusions. Rather, he rehashes his grounds for relief, and replies to respondent's answer to his petition. The court need not address Taylor's response because it does not specifically object to the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. <u>See Battle</u>, 834 F.2d at 421.

Therefore,

The court accepts the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and ORDERS that the petition of Adolphus Taylor for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be, and is hereby, denied.

The court further ORDERS that all motions not previously ruled upon in the above-captioned action be, and are hereby, denied.

SIGNED November 2, 2007.

JOHN McBRYDE United States District Judge